

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION

CHUKWUMA E. AZUBUKO,
Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 2:05-CV-363
JUDGE EDMUND A. SARGUS, JR.

CITY OF BOSTON – PARKING CLERK,
Defendant.

ORDER

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff Chukwuma E. Azubuko's motion reconsideration. Doc. 25. Plaintiff specifically seeks reconsideration of the Court's December 17, 2013 Order, doc. 24, denying Plaintiff's motion for relief from judgment, doc. 23.

The Court has authority, both under common law and the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, to reconsider interlocutory orders before the entry of final judgment. *See In re Life Investors Ins. Co. of Am.*, 589 F.3d 319, 326 n.6 (6th Cir. 2009) ("[A] district court may always reconsider and revise its interlocutory orders while it retains jurisdiction over the case."). "Traditionally, courts will find justification for reconsidering interlocutory orders when there is (1) an intervening change of controlling law; (2) new evidence available; or (3) a need to correct a clear error or prevent manifest injustice." *Rodriguez v. Tenn. Laborers Health & Welfare Fund*, 89 F. App'x 949, 959 (6th Cir. 2004); *see also Tenn. Protection & Advocacy, Inc. v. Wells*, 371 F.3d 342, 348 (6th Cir. 2004) (defining manifest injustice as "[a]n error in the trial court that is direct, obvious, and observable").

The Court finds reconsideration or alteration of its previous order unnecessary. Plaintiff has failed to satisfy the standards for reconsideration. He has not pointed to—nor is the Court aware of—an intervening change of controlling law. Nor does Plaintiff present any new evidence since the Court's previous order. As to his final avenue, Plaintiff fails to show that the Court should change its previous ruling in order to correct a manifest injustice. For these reasons, Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration, doc. 25, is **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

1-17-2014
DATED


EDMUND A. SARGUS, JR.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE